

From: mrsc@herspace.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: 1/29/03 2:48PM
Subject: I oppose media concentration!

Chairman Michael K. Powell:

Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of 2002 Biennial Regulatory Review -
Review of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rules
and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202
of the Telecommunications Act of 1996,
Notice of Proposed Rulemaking,
MM Docket No. 02-277, (rel. Sept. 23, 2002)

I am writing to you today to comment on Docket No. 02-277, the Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcast media ownership rules. In promoting its supposed goals of fair competition, diversity and local voice in today's media market, I strongly believe that the FCC should retain all of the current media ownership rules now in question. These rules serve the public interest by limiting the market power of the huge, dominant companies and players in the broadcast industry.

I do not believe that the studies commissioned by the FCC accurately demonstrate, or even attempt to demonstrate, the negative effects that media deregulation and consolidation have had on the diversity of our media. While there may indeed be more sources of media than ever before, the spectrum of views presented has been severely limited.

The right to conduct an informed debate and discussion of current events is part of the founding philosophy of our nation. Our forefathers believed that democracy was renewed in the marketplace of diverse ideas. If the FCC allows our media outlets to merge and consolidate further, our ability to have an open, informed discussion from a wide variety of viewpoints will be compromised.

I urge the FCC to preserve the public interest by keeping the media ownership rules in question intact.

Also, I support the FCC's plan to hold a public hearing on this matter in Richmond, VA in February of 2003. I strongly encourage the Commission to hold similar hearings in all parts of the country and solicit the widest possible participation from the public. The rarified, lawyerly atmosphere of an FCC rulemaking is not an appropriate decision-making venue when questions as profound as the freedom of our media are at stake. I encourage the Commissioners to come out and meet some of the people who do not have a financial interest in this issue, but a social interest.

With the serious impact these rule changes will have on our democracy, it is important that the Commission take the time to review these issues more thoroughly and allow the American people to have a meaningful say in the process.

Thank you,

Taleisha L. Collins

**7979 Glenview Drive
Indianapolis. IN, 46236**

From: adminOdedanaan.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: 1/29/03 2:48PM
Subject: I oppose media concentration!

Chairman Michael K. Powell:

Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of 2002 Biennial Regulatory Review -
Review of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rules
and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202
of the Telecommunications Act of 1996.
Notice of Proposed Rulemaking,
MM Docket No. 02-277, (rel. Sept. 23, 2002)

I am writing to you today to comment on Docket No. 02-277, the Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcast media ownership rules. In promoting its supposed goals of fair competition, diversity and local voice in today's media market, I strongly believe that the FCC should retain all of the current media ownership rules now in question. These rules serve the public interest by limiting the market power of the huge, dominant companies and players in the broadcast industry.

I do not believe that the studies commissioned by the FCC accurately demonstrate, or even attempt to demonstrate, the negative effects that media deregulation and consolidation have had on the diversity of our media. While there may indeed be more sources of media than ever before, the spectrum of views presented has been severely limited.

The right to conduct an informed debate and discussion of current events is part of the founding philosophy of our nation. Our forefathers believed that democracy was renewed in the marketplace of diverse ideas. If the FCC allows our media outlets to merge and consolidate further, our ability to have an open, informed discussion from a wide variety of viewpoints will be compromised.

I urge the FCC to preserve the public interest by keeping the media ownership rules in question intact.

Also, I support the FCC's plan to hold a public hearing on this matter in Richmond, VA in February of 2003. I strongly encourage the Commission to hold similar hearings in all parts of the country and solicit the widest possible participation from the public, and to give adequate time to all parties to submit written commentary, as well. The rarified, lawyerly atmosphere of an FCC rulemaking is not an appropriate decision-making venue when questions as profound as the freedom of our media are at stake. I encourage the Commissioners to come out and meet some of the people who do not have a financial interest in this issue, but a social interest.

With the serious impact these rule changes will have on our democracy, it is important that the Commission take the time to review these issues more thoroughly and allow the American people to have a meaningful say in the

process

I would also suggest an independent investigation of the disparity in rules and regulations, fees, royalties, and user demographics reporting requirements covering over-the-air radio broadcasters as compared with those recently imposed on webradio broadcasters. The current regulations and fee structures in place for webradio broadcasters are prohibitively expensive for those that do NOT charge for or profit from their radio stations (when added to ASCAP and other organizations' requirements, a typical webcaster can expect to pay in excess of 52,000.00 just in fees and permits). Why are webcasters being required to pay a per song royalty fee to artists when over-the-air broadcasters (who are typically paid by record labels to play their music) have no **such** requirement? I suggest a serious, in-depth investigation is called for, and I urge you to *see* to it that webcasters are not unfairly regulated out of existence. You can read more of my views on this specific issue at [http://www.3dvrweb.com/article/entitled "Why Music Sucks Today"](http://www.3dvrweb.com/article/entitled/Why%20Music%20Sucks%20Today) (pardon the title).

Thank you,

Pamela McDermott
707 Michigan Ave.
Ontonagon, MI 49953
admin@dedanaan.com

707 Michigan Ave.
Ontonagon, MI, 49953

From: emily@loopylulu.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: 1/29/03 2:48PM
Subject: I oppose media concentration!

Chairman Michael K. Powell:

Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of 2002 Biennial Regulatory Review -
Review of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rules
and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202
of the Telecommunications Act of 1996,
Notice of Proposed Rulemaking.
MM Docket No. 02-277, (rel. Sept. 23, 2002)

I am writing to you today to comment on Docket No. 02-277, the Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcast media ownership rules. In promoting its supposed goals of fair competition, diversity and local voice in today's media market, I strongly believe that the FCC should retain all of the current media ownership rules now in question. These rules serve the public interest by limiting the market power of the huge, dominant companies and players in the broadcast industry.

I do not believe that the studies commissioned by the FCC accurately demonstrate, or even attempt to demonstrate, the negative effects that media deregulation and consolidation have had on the diversity of our media. While there may indeed be more sources of media than ever before, the spectrum of views presented has been severely limited.

The right to conduct an informed debate and discussion of current events is part of the founding philosophy of our nation. Our forefathers believed that democracy was renewed in the marketplace of diverse ideas. If the FCC allows our media outlets to merge and consolidate further, our ability to have an open, informed discussion from a wide variety of viewpoints will be compromised.

I urge the FCC to preserve the public interest by keeping the media ownership rules in question intact.

Also, I support the FCC's plan to hold a public hearing on this matter in Richmond, VA in February of 2003. I strongly encourage the Commission to hold similar hearings in all parts of the country and solicit the widest possible participation from the public. The rarified, lawyerly atmosphere of an FCC rulemaking is not an appropriate decision-making venue when questions as profound as the freedom of our *media are at stake*. I encourage the Commissioners to come out and meet some of the people who do not have a financial interest in this issue, but a social interest.

With the serious impact these rule changes will have on our democracy, it is important that the Commission take the time to review these issues more thoroughly and allow the American people to have a meaningful say in the process.

Thank you,

Emily Leffler

702 Chaney Dr. #304
Takorna Park, MD, 20912

From: tomas Qaccessliving.org
To: Mike Powell
Date: 1/29/03 2:48PM
Subject: I oppose media concentration!

Chairman Michael K. Powell:

Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of 2002 Biennial Regulatory Review -
Review of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rules
and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202
of the Telecommunications Act of 1996,
Notice of Proposed Rulemaking,
MM Docket No. 02-277, (rel. Sept. 23, 2002)

I am writing to you today to comment on Docket No. 02-277, the Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcast media ownership rules. In its goals to promote competition, diversity and localism in today's media market, I strongly believe that the FCC should strengthen all of the current media ownership rules now in question. These rules should serve the public interest by limiting the market power of already huge companies in the broadcast industry. This media concentration hurts our democratic processes and supports a corporate and economic agenda that leads to increasing concentrations of wealth and power.

I do not believe that the studies commissioned by the FCC miss the point completely concerning the negative affects media deregulation and consolidation have had on media diversity and the broad coverage of important issues. While there may indeed be more sources of media than ever before, the spectrum of views presented have become much more limited and the selection of issues covered left to corporate elites.

The right to carry on informed debate and discussion of current events is part of the founding philosophy of our nation. Our forefathers believed that democracy was best served by a diverse marketplace of ideas. As the FCC has allowed our media outlets to merge, our ability to have an open, informed discussion from a wide variety of viewpoints has been compromised.

The public interest will best be served by preserving media ownership rules in question in this proceeding.

In addition, I support the FCC's plan to hold a public hearing on this matter in Richmond, VA in February 2003. I strongly encourage the Commission to hold similar hearings in all parts of the country (including Chicago) and solicit the widest possible participation from the public. The rarified, lawyerly atmosphere of an FCC rulemaking is not an appropriate decision-making venue in a democracy when questions as

profound as the freedom of our media are at stake. I encourage the Commissioners to come out and meet some of the people who do not have a financial interest in this issue, but a social interest.

With the serious impact these rule changes will have on our democracy, it is important that the Commission take the time to review these issues more thoroughly and allow the American people to have a meaningful say in the process.

Thank you.

With the deepest concern,
Tom Wilson

3950 N. Lakeshore Dr. #1501
Chicago, IL, 60613

From: mrsc@herspace.com
To: Michael Copps
Date: 1/29/03 2:48PM
Subject: I oppose media concentration!

Commissioner Michael J. Copps:

Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of 2002 Biennial Regulatory Review -
Review of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rules
and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202
of the Telecommunications Act of 1996,
Notice of Proposed Rulemaking,
MM Docket No. 02-277, (rel. Sept. 23, 2002)

I am writing to you today to comment on Docket No. 02-277, the Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcast media ownership rules. In promoting its supposed goals of fair competition, diversity and local voice in today's media market, I strongly believe that the FCC should retain all of the current media ownership rules now in question. These rules serve the public interest by limiting the market power of the huge, dominant companies and players in the broadcast industry.

I do not believe that the studies commissioned by the FCC accurately demonstrate, or even attempt to demonstrate, the negative effects that media deregulation and consolidation have had on the diversity of our media. While there may indeed be more sources of media than ever before, the spectrum of views presented has been severely limited.

The right to conduct an informed debate and discussion of current events is part of the founding philosophy of our nation. Our forefathers believed that democracy was renewed in the marketplace of diverse ideas. If the FCC allows our media outlets to merge and consolidate further, our ability to have an open, informed discussion from a wide variety of viewpoints will be compromised.

I urge the FCC to preserve the public interest by keeping the media ownership rules in question intact.

Also, I support the FCC's plan to hold a public hearing on this matter in Richmond, VA in February of 2003. I strongly encourage the Commission to hold similar hearings in all parts of the country and solicit the widest possible participation from the public. The rarified, lawyerly atmosphere of an FCC rulemaking is not an appropriate decision-making venue when questions as profound as the freedom of our media are at stake. I encourage the Commissioners to come out and meet some of the people who do not have a financial interest in this issue, but a social interest.

With the serious impact these rule changes will have on our democracy, it is important that the Commission take the time to review these issues more thoroughly and allow the American people to have a meaningful say in the process.

Thank you,

Taleisha L. Collins

7979 Glenview Drive
Indianapolis, IN, 46236

From: adminQdedanaan.com
To: Michael Copps
Date: 1/29/03 2:48PM
Subject: I oppose media concentration!

Commissioner Michael J. Copps:

Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of 2002 Biennial Regulatory Review -
Review of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rules
and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202
of the Telecommunications Act of 1996,
Notice of Proposed Rulemaking,
MM Docket No. 02-277, (rel. Sept. 23, 2002)

I am writing to you today to comment on Docket No. 02-277, the Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcast media ownership rules. In promoting its supposed goals of fair competition, diversity and local voice in today's media market, I strongly believe that the FCC should retain all of the current media ownership rules now in question. These rules serve the public interest by limiting the market power of the huge, dominant *companies* and players in the broadcast industry.

I do not believe that the studies commissioned by the FCC accurately demonstrate, or even attempt to demonstrate, the negative effects that media deregulation and consolidation have had on the diversity of our media. While there may indeed be more sources of media than ever before, the spectrum of views presented has been severely limited.

The right to conduct an informed debate and discussion of current events is part of the founding philosophy of our nation. Our forefathers believed that democracy was renewed in the marketplace of diverse ideas. If the FCC allows our media outlets to merge and consolidate further, our ability to have an open, informed discussion from a wide variety of viewpoints will be compromised.

I urge the FCC to preserve the public interest by keeping the media ownership rules in question intact.

Also, I support the FCC's plan to hold a public hearing on this matter in Richmond, VA in February of 2003. I strongly encourage the Commission to hold similar hearings in all parts of the country and solicit the widest possible participation from the public, and to give adequate time to all parties to submit written commentary, as well. The rarified, lawyerly atmosphere of an FCC rulemaking is not an appropriate decision-making venue when *questions* as profound as the freedom of our media are at stake. I encourage the Commissioners to come out and meet some of the people who do not have a financial interest in this issue, but a social interest.

With the serious impact these rule changes will have on our democracy, it is important that the Commission take the time to review these issues more thoroughly and allow the American people to have a meaningful say in the

process

I would also suggest an independent investigation of the disparity in rules and regulations, fees, royalties, and user demographics reporting requirements covering over-the-air radio broadcasters as compared with those recently imposed on webradio broadcasters. The current regulations and fee structures in place for webradio broadcasters are prohibitively expensive for those that do NOT charge for or profit from their radio stations (when added to ASCAP and other organizations' requirements, a typical webcaster can expect to pay in excess of \$2,000.00 just in fees and permits). Why are webcasters being required to pay a per song royalty fee to artists when over-the-air broadcasters (who are typically paid by record labels to play their music) have no such requirement? I suggest a serious, in-depth investigation is called for, and I urge you to see to it that webcasters are not unfairly regulated out of existence. You can read more of my views on this specific issue at [http://www.3dvrweb.com/article/entitled "Why Music Sucks Today"](http://www.3dvrweb.com/article/entitled/Why+Music+Sucks+Today) (pardon the title).

Thank you,

Pamela McDermott
707 Michigan Ave.
Ontonagon, MI 49953
admin@dedanaan.com

707 Michigan Ave.
Ontonagon, MI, 49953

From: emily@loopylulu.com
To: Michael Copps
Date: 1/29/03 2:48PM
Subject: I oppose media concentration!

Commissioner Michael J. Copps:

Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of 2002 Biennial Regulatory Review -
Review of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rules
and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202
of the Telecommunications Act of 1996,
Notice of Proposed Rulemaking.
MM Docket No. 02-277, (rel. Sept. 23, 2002)

I am writing to you today to comment on Docket No. 02-277, the Biennial Review of **the FCC's** broadcast media ownership rules. In promoting its supposed goals of fair competition, diversity and local voice in today's media market, I strongly believe that the FCC should retain all of the current media ownership rules now in question. These rules serve the public interest by limiting the market power of the huge, dominant companies and players in the broadcast industry.

I do not believe that the studies commissioned by the FCC accurately demonstrate, or even attempt to demonstrate, the negative effects that media deregulation and consolidation have had on the diversity of our media. While there may indeed be more sources of media than ever before, the spectrum of views presented has been severely limited.

The right to conduct an informed debate and discussion **of** current **events** is part of the founding philosophy of our nation. Our forefathers believed that democracy was renewed in the marketplace of diverse ideas. If the FCC allows our media outlets to merge and consolidate further, our ability to have an open, informed discussion from a wide variety of viewpoints will be compromised.

I urge the FCC to preserve the public interest by keeping the media ownership rules in question intact.

Also, I support the FCC's plan to hold a public hearing on this matter in Richmond, **VA** in February of 2003. I strongly encourage the Commission to hold similar hearings in all parts of the country and solicit the widest possible participation from the public. The rarified, lawyerly atmosphere of an FCC rulemaking is not an appropriate decision-making venue when questions as profound as the freedom of our media are at stake. **I** encourage the Commissioners to come out and meet some of the people who do not have a financial interest in this issue, **but** a social interest.

With the serious impact these rule changes will have on our democracy, it is important that the Commission take the time to review these issues more thoroughly and allow the American people to have a meaningful say in the process.

Thank you,

Emily Leffler

702 Chaney Dr. #304
Takoma Park, MD. 20912

From: tomas@accessliving.org
To: Michael Copps
Date: 1/29/03 2:48PM
Subject: I oppose media concentration!

Commissioner Michael J. Copps:

Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of 2002 Biennial Regulatory Review -
Review of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rules
and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202
of the Telecommunications Act of 1996.
Notice of Proposed Rulemaking,
MM Docket No. 02-277, (rel. Sept. 23, 2002)

I am writing to you today to comment on Docket No. 02-277, the Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcast media ownership rules. In it's goals to promote competition, diversity and localism in today's media market, I strongly believe that the FCC should strengthen all of the current media ownership rules now in question. These rules should *serve* the public interest by limiting the market power of already huge companies in the broadcast industry. This media concentration hurls our democratic processes and supports a corporate and economic agenda that leads to increasing concentrations of wealth and power.

I do not believe that the studies commissioned by the FCC miss the point completely concerning the negative affects media deregulation and consolidation have had on media diversity and the broad coverage of important issues. While there may indeed be more sources of media than ever before, the spectrum of views presented have become much more limited and the selection of issues covered left to corporate elites.

The right to carry on informed debate and discussion of current events is part of the founding philosophy of our nation. Our forefathers believed that democracy was best served by a diverse marketplace of ideas. **As** the FCC has allowed our media outlets to merge, our ability to have an open, informed discussion from a wide variety of viewpoints has been compromised.

The public interest will best be served by preserving media ownership rules in question in this proceeding.

In addition, I support the FCC's plan to hold a public hearing on this matter in Richmond, VA in February 2003. I strongly encourage the commission to hold similar hearings in all parts of the country (including Chicago) and solicit the widest possible participation from the public. The rarified, lawyerly atmosphere of an FCC rulemaking is not an appropriate decision-making venue in a democracy when questions as

profound as the freedom of our media are at stake. I encourage the Commissioners to come out and meet some of the people who do not have a financial interest in this issue, but a social interest.

With the serious impact these rule changes will have on our democracy, it is important that the Commission take the time to review these issues more thoroughly and allow the American people to have a meaningful say in the process.

Thank you,

With the deepest concern,
Tom Wilson

3950 N. Lakeshore Dr. #1501
Chicago, IL, 60613

From: Lucas Larson
To: Mike Powell
Date: 1/27/03 7:55AM
Subject: Keep media free and competitive

Dear Commissioner Powell:

One of the basic elements which help to keep the American media at least partially free and independent is the set of FCC regulations restricting consolidation and monopolies.

In the 2002 Biennial Review, the FCC appears to be planning to roll back many of these protective regulations: the Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Rule, the National Broadcast Ownership Cap, *the* Local Radio Ownership Rule, the Duopoly Rule and the Dual Network Rule.

Relaxation or abandonment of the preceding rules will result in the purchase *of* local and independent newspapers and radio and television stations by large media giants. The cost to the American People and Democracy will *be far* too high if local news, reportorial freedom and access to a true variety of legitimate views are *further* compromised.

Commissioner Powell, I urge you to make sure the FCC does not relax or drop these vital regulatory rules.

Sincerely,

Lucas Larson

From: Joyce Asfour
To: Mike Powell
Date: 1/29/03 9:50AM
Subject: Keep media free and compellive

Dear Commissioner Powell:

One of the basic elements which help to keep the American media at least partially free and independent is the set of FCC regulations restricting consolidation and monopolies.

In the 2002 Biennial Review, the FCC appears to be planning to roll back many of these protective regulations: the Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Rule, the National Broadcast Ownership Cap, the Local Radio Ownership Rule, the Duopoly Rule and the Dual Network Rule.

Relaxation or abandonment of the preceding rules will result in the purchase of local and independent newspapers and radio and television stations by large media giants. The cost to the American People and Democracy will be far too high if local news, reporaliorial freedom and access to a true variety of legitimate views are further compromised.

Commissioner Powell, I urge you to make sure the FCC does not relax or drop these vital regulatory rules.

Sincerely,

Joyce W. Asfour
6037 Cary Ave
Cincinnati, OH 45224

Get the Internet just the way you want it.
Free software, free e-mail, and free Internet access for a month!
Try Juno Web: <http://dl.www.juno.com/dynoget/tagj>.

From: Karin Schein
To: Mike Powell
Date: 1/29/03 9:50AM
Subject: Keep media free and competitive

Dear Commissioner Powell:

One of the basic elements which help to keep the American media at least partially free and independent is the set of FCC regulations restricting consolidation and monopolies.

In the 2002 Biennial Review, the FCC appears to be planning to roll back many of these protective regulations: the Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Rule, the National Broadcast Ownership Cap, the Local Radio Ownership Rule, the Duopoly Rule and the Dual Network Rule,

Relaxation or abandonment of the preceding rules will result in the purchase of local and independent newspapers and radio and television stations by large media giants. The cost to the American People and Democracy will be far too high if local news, reportorial freedom and access to a true variety of legitimate views are further compromised.

Commissioner Powell, I urge you to make sure the FCC does not relax or drop these vital regulatory rules.

Sincerely,

Karin Schein

From: Joyce Asfour
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 1/29/03 9:49AM
Subject: Keep media free and competitive

Dear Commissioner:

One of the basic elements which help to keep the American media at least partially free and independent is the set of FCC regulations restricting consolidation and monopolies.

In the 2002 Biennial Review, the FCC appears to be planning to roll back many of these protective regulations: the Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Rule, the National Broadcast Ownership Cap, the Local Radio Ownership Rule, the Duopoly Rule and the Dual Network Rule.

Relaxation or abandonment of the preceding rules will result in the purchase of local and independent newspapers and radio and television stations by large media giants. The cost to the American People and Democracy will be far too high if local news, reportorial freedom and access to a true variety of legitimate views are further compromised.

Commissioner, I urge you to make sure the FCC does not relax or drop these vital regulatory rules.

Sincerely,

Joyce W. Asfour
6037 Cary Ave
Cincinnati, OH 45224

Get the Internet just the way you want it.
Free software, free e-mail, and free Internet access for a month!
Try Juno Web: <http://ldl.w.juno.com/ldynogeVtagj>.

From: Karin Schein
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 1/29/03 9:49AM
Subject: Keep media free and competitive

Dear Commissioner:

One of the basic elements which help to keep the American media at least partially free and independent is the set of FCC regulations restricting consolidation and monopolies.

In the 2002 Biennial Review, the FCC appears to be planning to roll back many of these protective regulations: the Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Rule, the National Broadcast Ownership Cap, the Local Radio Ownership Rule, the Duopoly Rule and the Dual Network Rule.

Relaxation or abandonment of the preceding rules will result in the purchase of local and independent newspapers and radio and television stations by large media giants. The cost to the American People and Democracy will be far too high if local news, reportorial freedom and access to a true variety of legitimate views are further compromised.

Commissioner, I urge you to make sure the FCC does not relax or drop these vital regulatory rules.

Sincerely,

Karin Schein

From: Joyce Asfour
To: Michael Copps
Date: 1/29/03 9:50AM
Subject: Keep media free and competitive

Dear Commissioner:

One of the basic elements which help to keep the American media at least partially free and independent is the set of FCC regulations restricting consolidation and monopolies.

In the 2002 Biennial Review, the FCC appears to be planning to roll back many of these protective regulations: the Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Rule, the National Broadcast Ownership Cap, the Local Radio Ownership Rule, the Duopoly Rule and the Dual Network Rule.

Relaxation or abandonment of the preceding rules will result in the purchase of local and independent newspapers and radio and television stations by large media giants. The cost to the American People and Democracy will be far too high if local news, reportorial freedom and access to a true variety of legitimate views are further compromised.

Commissioner, I urge you to make sure the FCC does not relax or drop these vital regulatory rules.

Sincerely,

Joyce W. Asfour
6037 Cary Ave
Cincinnati, OH 45224

Get the Internet just the way you want it.
Free software, free e-mail, and free Internet access for a month!
Try Juno Web: <http://dl.www.juno.com/dynoget/tagj>.

From: Karin Schein
To: Michael Copps
Date: 1/29/03 9:50AM
Subject: Keep media free and competitive

Dear Commissioner:

One of the basic elements which help to keep the American media at least partially free and independent is the set of FCC regulations restricting consolidation and monopolies.

In the 2002 Biennial Review, the FCC appears to be planning to roll back many of these protective regulations: the Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Rule, the National Broadcast Ownership Cap, the Local Radio Ownership Rule, the Duopoly Rule and the Dual Network Rule.

Relaxation or abandonment of the preceding rules will result in the purchase of local and independent newspapers and radio and television stations by large media giants. The cost to the American People and Democracy will be far too high if local news, reportorial freedom and access to a true variety of legitimate views are further compromised.

Commissioner, I urge you to make sure the FCC does not relax or drop these vital regulatory rules.

Sincerely,

Karin Schein

From: basil@lifeformz.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: 1/29/03 10:21AM
Subject: Media Concentration: reply to public comments

Chairman Michael K. Powell:

Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of 2002 Biennial Regulatory Review -
Review of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rules
and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202
of the Telecommunications Act of 1996,
Notice of Proposed Rulemaking.
MM Docket No. 02-277, (rel. Sept. 23, 2002)

I am writing to you today to reply to the public comments on Docket No. 02-277, The Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcast media ownership rules. To promote competition, diversity and local content, the FCC should retain the current media ownership rules and impose stricter public interest requirements.

The studies commissioned by the FCC are flawed and incomplete. By allowing our media outlets to merge print and broadcast facilities a greater restriction on the breadth of news and information available to citizens to act in the public interest will result.

The public interest will best be served by preserving media ownership rules in question in this proceeding.

In addition, I strongly encourage the Commission to hold hearings in all parts of the country and solicit the widest possible participation from the public which will be the most directly affected by the outcomes of these decisions.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Brian

1167 Bush Street #501
San Francisco, CA, 94109

From: olneytjQattbi.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: 1/29/03 10:21AM
Subject: Media Concentration: reply to public comments

Chairman Michael K. Powell:

Before the
 FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
 Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of 2002 Biennial Regulatory Review -
 Review of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rules
 and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202
 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996,
 Notice of Proposed Rulemaking.
 MM Docket No. 02-277, (rel. Sept. 23, 2002)

I am a voter.
 I am a citizen.
 I am an educator.
 I hold a PhD in business from Columbia University

Your represent me and my fellow citizens.

I ask you to just say NO to any possibility of increasing the
 concentration of media ownership of any kind.

I am appalled by the continuing granting of monopoly licences to media
 corporations. The practice goes against every tenet of protection that
 the constitution tried to establish.

Please oppose any further changes that would allow media to be controlled
 by single organizations. This is NOT free enterprise, it is the
 government granting monopoly licenses. The 1996 Telecommunications act
 was a gross malfeasance of justice.

Although I generally favor free enterprise, there is no such thing in the
 broadcasting industry because the government grants monopoly licenses.

When you grant licenses, you must regulate those licenses in the public
 interest.

Allowing broadcast media companies to merge with print media companies is
 a very bad and dangerous idea that will come back to haunt every
 politician and government official.

It will essentially give the power to control elections, news, and the
 government to the most ruthless
 corporations, some of which are not even American corporations. Review
 your history. You will notice the problem first occurred in cities when
 there was only one newspaper. Electronic media has expanded the scope,
 but left the problem the same.

You must act now to insure that the press, and the rest of the media,